UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/661,827 | 09/12/2003 | Andreas Hartlep | SCHWP0177USA | 7728 |
| | 7590 02/25/200 O, BOISSELLE & SK | EXAMINER | | |
| Nineteenth Floor 1621 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, OH 44115-2191 | | | CHAO, ELMER M | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| , | | 3737 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 02/25/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 10/661,827 | HARTLEP ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Air Oille | |

| | ELIVIER CHAO | 3/3/ | |
|---|---|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>07 October 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | PPLICATION IN CONDITION FO | R ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | date of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Anno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE). | g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI | on. LED WITHIN TWO |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply original. | of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be | filed within two months | s of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b | out prior to the date of filing a brief, | will not be entered be | cause |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | | TE below); | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | ** | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett | er form for appeal by materially re- | ducing or simplifying ti | ne issues for |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | orresponding number of finally reig | acted claims | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | orresponding number of finally reju | solou olumno. | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 1 See attached Notice of Non-Co | mpliant Amendment (| PTOI -324) |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mphane / monamone (| 1 1 0 2 0 2 1). |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all | | timely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| non-allowable claim(s). | owasie ii odsimiled iii a ocparate, | amery med ameriamer | it dandeling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | ll be entered and an e | xplanation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-16 and 18-22</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fail | s to provide a |
| 10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | n of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attach | ed. |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached before the Disclosure Statement(s). | | n condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: | r 1 0/35/06) raper 140(5) | | |
| /Long V Le/ | /Elmer Chao/ | | |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3768 | Examiner, Art Unit 3737 | | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that Kucharczyk does not teach "capturing via an imaging system functional anatomical data and/or structural anatomical data before infusion of a fluid into the tissue". However, the claimed invention does not specifically state that the step of capturing can be done without the use of any infusion fluid. As Applicants have pointed out in the arguments, Kucharczyk's Fig. 7 does show that at least a second infusion is repeated after analysis of the first infusion. Therefore, Kucharczyk's teaching does satisfy the claimed limitation based on the fact that the subsequent infusion and therby injection of the infusion fluid is done after the analysis. Based on a previous interview conducted, Examiner recalls Applicants' hesistation to use the phrase "any infusion fluid" instead of the phrase "an infusion fluid". Therefore, Examiner cannot interpret the claims as they stand to convey the idea of not using "any infusion fluid". Examiner believes that the actual scope of this invention lies somewhere inbetween the literal interpretations of the phrases "any infusion fluid" and "an infusion fluid". In order to properly overcome Kucharczyk, Applicants are advised to provide antecedant basis for the phrase "infusion fluid" and/or "fluid" and correspond that phrase to the original intruduction of the fluid. Then, the steps of the subsequently claimed capturing and evaluating steps can be recited to eliminate the use of that specific infusion fluid, thereby overcoming Examiner's interpretation of Kucharczyk. Regarding the limitation "identifying direction channels within the tissue and determining infusion distribution information related to the identified channels". Examiner informs Applicants that as these limitations are worded, they can be reasonably interpreted first and foremost as mental steps. Furthermore, Applicants do not describe what it means specifically to "identify directional channels". However, Examiner has provided Applicants with Kucharczyk's explicit example of actually mapping the drug delivery (see at least fig. 7, fourth box from the bottom). Examiner asserts that this action of "mapping the drug delivery" would definitely satisfy the limitation "identify directional channels" to one of ordinary skill in the art.